

*THE COBDEN CLUB OF ENGLAND AND PROTECTION IN  
THE UNITED STATES.*

---

# A SPEECH

MADE AT A REPUBLICAN MEETING,

HELD AT

ASTORIA, NEW YORK,

OCTOBER 23D, 1884.

---

BY

THOMAS H. DUDLEY,

*Of Camden, New Jersey, late United States Consul at Liverpool, England.*

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
LIBRARY

Class

337.3

Book

D865c

Volume

Ja 09-20M

ECONOMICS  
DEPARTMENT

THE COBDEN CLUB OF ENGLAND AND PROTECTION IN  
THE UNITED STATES.

---

# A SPEECH

MADE AT A REPUBLICAN MEETING,

HELD AT

ASTORIA, NEW YORK,

OCTOBER 23D, 1884.

---

BY

THOMAS H. DUDLEY,

*Of Camden, New Jersey, late United States Consul at Liverpool, England.*



SPEECH  
OF  
HON. THOMAS H. DUDLEY,

DELIVERED BEFORE

A REPUBLICAN MEETING HELD THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER  
23D, 1884, AT THE ASSEMBLY ROOMS, ASTORIA (L. I.), N. Y.

---

MR. DUDLEY, being introduced to the audience by the chairman of the meeting, after referring to James G. Blaine, the Republican candidate, and Grover Cleveland, the Democratic candidate, and discussing their qualifications and characters, spoke as follows:—

I regard this election as one of the most important that has ever taken place in the history of our country—scarcely second to that which elected Mr. Lincoln! [Applause.]

The great question at issue is that of the tariff. It is a question whether you will adhere to the American system of protection, or whether you will adopt, in its place, the English system of a tariff for revenue only, or, in the words of the Democratic platform, a tariff exclusively for revenue.

That phrase, a tariff for revenue only, is not an American idea; it did not originate in this country; it is an English idea, and was borrowed by the Democratic party from England. It is the English system, and not ours. And the Democratic party in this country, to-day, is doing all

in its power to foster and fasten upon us the English system.

And you will have to decide this question at the election about to take place; every man here, when he goes up and puts in his ballot, will vote either in favor of the American system of protection, or the English system of free trade. James G. Blaine represents the former, and Grover Cleveland the latter, system.

The issue is well defined. The Republican party hold that our tariff should be sufficient in all things to protect the labor of the country, and to develop the resources of the country. [Applause.]

The Democratic party are somewhat divided upon the question. The great mass of their party, headed by Henry Watterson of Louisville, by Morrison of Illinois, by Carlisle the Speaker, by Tucker of Virginia, and by Frank Hurd of Ohio, who has just been defeated! [applause] are in favor of the English system or free trade.

Mr. Randall of Pennsylvania, and a few other Democrats, are not in favor of direct free trade, they favor a tariff for revenue so adjusted as to give slight incidental protection. And they differ with their fellow Democrats to this extent.

If you take up their platform, adopted at Chicago, you will find that the word "protection" does not appear in it, but is excluded from it. They were thirty-six hours in forming the tariff plank in their platform, and they purposely excluded the question of protection from it; but they did frame it in such a way as to sanction the ideas of Mr. Randall to enable him to go before his constituents in Pennsylvania and say, "I am in favor of a tariff so framed as to give incidental protection;" whilst Mr. Morrison, Frank Hurd, Mr. Carlisle, and Mr. Randolph Tucker of Virginia, and the rest of them, could go before their constituents East, West, North, and South and proclaim that the Democratic party favored "a tariff for revenue exclusively, or free trade."



I think I have stated their position correctly. I do not want to do them wrong or place them in a false position.

We differ from them. They make the revenue of first or primary importance. We do not. We make the protection of labor of first or primary importance, before revenue. [Applause.]

We demand a tariff, sufficient in all things to protect the laboring people of our country, and to develop the resources of the country. [Applause.] And this, if necessary, without regard to revenue.

But we contend that if the tariff is properly adjusted, so as in all things to protect labor, it will yield sufficient revenue to carry on the affairs of the Government without leaving a surplus. And we say that no tariff ought to be adopted unless it will properly protect labor.

This is the difference between the two parties. It is clear and well defined; one is a tariff for revenue only or free-trade, with a small fragment of the party desiring a tariff for revenue so adjusted as to give slight incidental protection—that is the Democratic side; our side is for a tariff sufficient to protect the labor of the country and to develop the resources of the country, without regard to revenue. [Applause.]

We had, by the last census, seventeen million and three hundred thousand (and a fraction over) of people who were earning wages in this country. And there were over thirty-two millions of people who did not earn wages.

Now it is these seventeen million three hundred thousand people who labor that the Republican party propose to protect, and we think they are entitled to more regard and more consideration in the adjustment of the tariff than the mere question of revenue. Take care of the people, and the people will take care of the revenue.

Labor builds the towns, develops the country, and produces all the improvements and commodities which you see and have around you. It is labor that has piled up the wealth of our country; it is labor that has given us our pros-

perity as a people and our power and greatness as a nation; it is labor that is now, either in the mill, the mine, work-shop, or the field, producing and developing our industries, and driving what we call the business of the country.

This being so, is not labor entitled to protection? What can be—what should be of more importance to a government than the happiness, welfare, and prosperity of the people, and especially those who have to toil.

The English system of a tariff for revenue only does not look at or consider the question of labor; it is indifferent to the laboring class and their wants.

The American system regards labor as of primary importance—as above everything else.

And this is the difference between the two systems; and when you come to vote, you will vote for one or the other of those systems; and you can not very well escape it.

It is a question that comes home to every man and to every woman in our land. It is a question of bread and butter, as I shall show you before I get through.

Now, we have had the American system of protection since 1861, and permit me to show you what it has accomplished.

In 1860, before the adoption of the protective tariff, the commerce of our country—I mean, the foreign commerce, exports and imports—was less than \$700,000,000. Last year it amounted to over \$1,500,000,000.

In 1860 we had about thirty thousand miles of railway in operation. We have to-day over one hundred and twenty-four thousand miles. Nearly if not quite as many miles as they have in the whole of Europe together.

Our population in 1860 was thirty millions and a fraction over; to-day, I suppose, it amounts to fifty-six millions.

The internal commerce of our country to-day amounts to over \$10,000,000,000, an amount about equal to the external commerce of all the nations in Europe put together.



The manufactured commodities of our country, in 1860, amounted to \$1,800,000,000. To-day they amount to over \$7,000,000,000.

The material wealth of our country, in 1860, was computed to be \$16,000,000,000, about \$10,000,000,000 less than that of England. To-day it is computed to be over \$50,000,000,000, about \$10,000,000,000 more than that of England.

The manufactured commodities of our country are stated to be about \$7,000,000,000. That is over \$1,000,000,000 more than are made by England or any other country in the world.

You may search history, either sacred or profane, modern or ancient, and you will not find one single example of a nation that has ever made progress equal to ours, during an equal period of time.

And to-day, among the nations of the earth, in *wealth*, in *power*, in *grandeur* and in *civilization*, the *United States of America stands the first* in the world. [Prolonged applause.] And when you take into consideration the fact that for more than four years of this time we had a great civil war which almost paralyzed every kind of business and industry and spread ruin and desolation over a large portion of the country, our progress is almost marvelous.

But this is not all the benefits protection has given us. In producing these manufactured goods—those \$7,000,000,000 worth—the profits have been retained here at home; the wages for producing them have been paid to our people and also retained here; these profits and these wages having thus remained at home and heaped up in this country instead of being spent in Europe in the production and purchase of the goods there, have had the effect of causing the balance of trade, for the last nine years, in our country, to be in our favor, without one single intermission; and it amounts in the aggregate, in the nine years, to \$1,380,000,000. This, with the profits from our industries, has made money cheap; and by money becoming cheap you have reduced the interest on all the indebtedness and borrowed

money in the country, National, State, municipal, and individual.

Have you taken this matter into consideration and seen its effect upon society and the business of the country?

Why! The National indebtedness, the State indebtedness, and the municipalities' indebtedness, in this country, by the last census, amounted to \$3,321,718,547. And in consequence of this accumulation of money in this country, and its cheapness, it has reduced the rate of interest at least two per cent., not only upon the National indebtedness, but upon individual indebtedness in every State in the Union.

I have looked into the matter myself, and I have found this to be the case, whether it is in New York, New Jersey, Ohio, California, or any other State.

Well, two per cent. on our National indebtedness, and the State indebtedness, and the municipality indebtedness, amounts to \$66,000,000 a year, and in taxes you save that amount every year.

Then the funded railway indebtedness of this country amounts to \$3,455,040,383, and two per cent. on this sum is over \$69,000,000 every year.

And if you take the indebtedness of individuals on bonds and mortgages in the country, and put it at \$6,000,000,000, (and, I suppose, it is very much over this), two per cent. upon that sum is \$120,000,000 a year.

Now, these three sums when added together make \$255,000,000 a year, which is the saving to our people who have to borrow money and pay interest. And generally this reduction and saving is to the industrious and laboring classes of our country. As a rule, it is this class that receives the most benefit from cheap money.

It is the men who borrow the money who get the benefit of the reduction; the capitalist loses it! The rich suffer the loss, and the poor who borrow, are the gainers! I do not pretend that we have as yet realized the full benefit of this cheapness of money. There is much of this indebtedness upon bonds—railroads and others—that are long

bonds and have not yet matured, and the effect of this reduction has not been realized; but these long bonds are day by day maturing. Upon the individual indebtedness between man and man upon bonds and mortgages, in most cases, it has taken effect already; and the farmers and laboring men, and the business men of the country at this time, are receiving the benefit from it.

Now, when the Democratic party tell you that you are being robbed by the protective tariff in the duties you have to pay on imports, just tell them that the saving on the money loaned in this country amounts to more than all the duties we collect under our tariff.

Do you know what the largest amount of revenue is that we have ever collected from our tariff? Outside of tonnage dues it has been only about \$216,000,000 in a year, and last year it only amounted to one hundred and ninety millions and a fraction of dollars, while this reduction in the interest on the indebtedness of the country amounts to over \$255,000,000, and the laboring men and the business men of the country generally get the benefit of it. It is difficult, if not impossible, to estimate or compute the benefits of this cheapening of money and the reduction of interest. It stimulates all kinds of business. There is not an industry but what is affected by it. Its effects are felt in the shop, in the mill, in the mine, and on the farm. This is one of the causes for the most extraordinary progress and development of our country since 1860.

But this is not all the benefit that we have received from our protective system.

I have told you that the manufactured products of this country amounted to \$7,000,000,000 last year. Well, the agricultural products of our country amounted to not less than \$3,000,000,000 outside of tobacco and cotton; and therefore those two industries alone, without the products from the mines and forests, amount to \$10,000,000,000 a year. Of the manufactured products used in this country

last year, over ninety-two per cent. were made in this country and less than eight per cent. imported.

And of the agricultural products, I mean outside of tobacco and outside of cotton, amounting to about \$3,000,000,000—over ninety-two per cent. of these products are now consumed in this country, and less than eight per cent. exported.

The manufacturing industry and the other industries of the country consume of the farmers' products over ninety-two per cent. That, of itself, has a most important bearing upon our progress, and, when taken in connection with our making of over ninety-two per cent. of the manufactured commodities which we use or consume, accounts in a large measure for the marvelous development and progress we have made.

Now, with all these most extraordinary results from our protective system, such as the world has never before seen, we are called upon by the Democratic party to abandon it, and adopt or take in its place the English system of free trade. I say we are called upon by the Democratic party; but not by them alone, for England is also demanding of us the adoption of their system, and is working and doing all she can in connection with the Democratic party to force their free trade system upon us.

England takes a deep interest in this question. You have all heard, because you all read, the expressions that were made by the English newspapers and by the English people when Grover Cleveland was nominated.

There is not to-day a single English newspaper that is in favor of Blaine; there is not a single English newspaper to-day but what is in favor of Cleveland. There is not a prominent Englishman to-day who is not anxious to see Cleveland elected and Blaine defeated.

I was in England myself last December when Carlisle was elected speaker over Randall, and if I had been a free trader and there had been nothing else to move me I should have abandoned free trade and become a protec-

tionist. Their rejoicing over this election would have been quite enough to have driven all free trade ideas out of me.

England, in order to carry out this work of breaking down protection, has formed the Cobden Club; and for wealth, for power, and for the influence of its members, I know of no political organization that is equal to it. It includes among its members statesmen, politicians, bankers, merchants, manufacturers, the legal profession, ministers of the gospel, and even the Lord Chief Justice of England—Lord Chief Justice Coleridge is a member of it. It includes among its members two hundred and nineteen (219) members of Parliament, and every member of the present English Cabinet—save Lord Selbourne. It has its agents all over this country with its pamphlets and other documents, and now has as its chief agent the Democratic party of this country to assist it in its work.

Why, my fellow-citizens, they have distributed in this country over seven hundred thousand (700,000) copies of their documents and pamphlets to influence our people, with the intent and for the purpose of breaking down our protective system.

I am not speaking from rumor; I am not speaking from what the newspapers say, but I am speaking facts which I know to be true. I hold in my hand a copy of their own minutes for 1883, with a list of their members, that came directly from the Cobden Club to me, in the month of February of this year, whilst I was in London; I also hold in my hand a copy of the minutes of their last public meeting, which took place on the 19th of July of the present year; and I do not intend to misrepresent them, nor do I intend to state anything that I do not believe to be true.

The London *Times* in an editorial proclaimed this:—

“It is to the New World that the Cobden Club is chiefly looking as the most likely sphere for its vigorous foreign policy. It has done what it can in Europe, and it is now turning its eyes westward, and *bracing itself for the struggle* which is to come, but cannot *rest while the United States are UNSUBDUED.*”



That foreign institution, that foreign club, formed on English soil, sustained by English wealth, by English influence and English power, cannot rest until the United States are *subdued!* and they are now working to subdue us.

I have said they have agents all over this country; I have told you that they distributed seven hundred thousand (700,000) copies of their circulars in this country; I now tell you that they are very busy, that they are in your towns, and even in your colleges, your institutions of learning. This being so, Professor Elliott, of Harvard College—the president of that institution—was quite justified in saying that every student they turn out was in favor of free trade.

Why! the Cobden Club of England is there, giving silver medals, to-day, to students who write essays upon free trade. They are in Harvard College, they are in Yale College they are in Williams College, and I do not know in how many other institutions of learning, distributing their medals.

Let me read an extract from their minutes. It is the minutes of the annual meeting of the Cobden Club, held at the Century Club Rooms on Saturday, July 19th, 1884, entitled, "Special report for the Club. For the members of the Club alone." It reads as follows:—

"The Cobden medal for 1883 at Harvard University, United States of America, was awarded to Mr. Theodore L. Frothingham, for an essay on the decline and future of the American shipping. At Williams College, Massachusetts, United States of America, the Cobden medal for 1884 was won by Henry H. Wentworth, of Niagara Falls, N.Y., and the 1884 medal at Yale College, Connecticut, United States of America, was won by Robert Monro Boyd, of Mount Clair, New Jersey."

But they are not only giving silver medals to the students of our colleges. This is not all, but the man who teaches political economy in Yale College, Professor Sumner, is a member of the Cobden Club of England, and the man who teaches the students political economy in Williams College, Professor Perry, is also a member of the



Cobden Club. Their names appear in the list of members of the club.

Now, what else are they doing? I have told you that they are at work here among you. I might say, and with truth, that this institution—this English institution—to-day lies intrenched behind the Democratic party, and that the Democratic party is aiding them in their work, is aiding them as far as it can to break down our system of protection, with the view of substituting in its place the English system of a tariff for revenue only.

Let me read you from their minutes of 1883. I read from page 18 of their proceedings:—

“In the United States the events of the last few years, the efforts of many able and active free traders, and the exertions of your committee in disseminating publications, have had the effect of bringing free exchange to the front as one of the great questions of the day.”

The exertions of the committee of the Cobden Club, the committee who control their doings, and do their work, has had the effect to bring this question before our people in the front! And at their meeting held on the 19th of July of the present year, since the nomination of James G. Blaine as the Republican candidate [applause] and since the nomination of Grover Cleveland by the Democratic party [applause] they in their report say:—

“Your committee continues to afford all the assistance in their power to those who are laboring in the free trade cause in foreign countries. In America, in the course of political events there is great promise. Within the last three or four years the attention of the American people has been to a large extent directed to this question, which has long been kept very much out of sight by considerations arising out of the effects of the great civil war. The result of the turning of public attention in this direction is seen in the fact that revenue reform is becoming a leading question in the presidential contest, and is on the winning side.”

They say revenue reform is becoming a leading question in this contest, and is on the winning side!” This is the Cobden Club at its last session, and since the nominations for President were made.

Now, when I look over the country and see prominent men who are working with the Democrats to elect Cleveland, I naturally suppose that they are free traders, and if they are free traders they do not belong properly to the Republican party; and therefore, when I come to look at the list of members of the Cobden Club, and find Henry Ward Beecher among them [hisses and applause], I can understand why he supports Grover Cleveland. He ought to do so. He is a member of the Cobden Club, was elected in 1869. Probably with such a candidate as he (a teacher of Christianity) now supports, common charity would demand of us that we should throw a veil over him, and attribute his conduct and his action more to his attachment to free trade and the Cobden Club, than to any love, regard, or respect that he entertains for the character of the man for whom he is going to vote. [Applause.]

When I find the name of Carl Schurz, as I do, in the official list of members of the club, I can understand why he, too, intends to vote for Grover Cleveland, and is working to elect him. [Applause.] He became a member in 1872.

And that is not all; you have the name of Samuel S. Cox, who is running for Congress in New York, and W. R. Morrison of Illinois, who introduced the Morrison bill last winter, and Frank H. Hurd of Ohio, who has just been defeated, and J. Randolph Tucker of Virginia, and Henry Watterson of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, and Horace White and Parke Godwin of New York, as members of the Cobden Club, and when you find these men voting for or advocating the Morrison bill as they did, they were but carrying out the instructions of the Cobden Club. What are the instructions of the club? I have shown you, by reading the extracts, how busy they are in this country to-day, using their influence, using their power, and it may be their means also to elect Grover Cleveland, the candidate of the Democratic party. I will read from another of their books, which I also procured

from the Cobden Club in England, in February this present year. It is an address written by Mr. Mongredien, one of the men they employ to write for them, and it was issued by the Cobden Club and addressed directly to the farmers of America. Ay! they have the audacity and impertinence to come here, this English institution, and to take part and interfere in our elections, by making direct appeals to our people.

And now what are their instructions? I will read them:

"Let the American farmers give their support to no candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives who does not pledge himself, if elected, to propose, or at least to vote for, a reduction of five (5) per cent. every successive year on the *import duties* until the whole are abolished."

Let no farmer vote for any member of Congress until he has first pledged himself to vote for a reduction of five (5) per cent. from it until all the duties are abolished.

These are their instructions; and Mr. Cox, the member from New York, and Mr. Morrison, Frank Hurd, and Mr. Tucker, and the other members, have been doing what they could to carry them out. Ay! they have gone beyond. The instructions were only for five per cent. reduction every year, but the Morrison bill, which they did all in their power to pass, proposed a reduction of twenty per cent. It may be that new instructions have been issued, and that these members have them. If this is so, they can explain what they are.

Now all these prominent men, being members of the Cobden Club, you can not expect them to vote for James G. Blaine [applause]; you can not expect Henry Ward Beecher to do this; you can not expect Carl Schurz, Horace White, or Parke Godwin to do it; and I say to you all, if you want to repeal the American system, if you want to adopt English free trade, then it is your duty to vote for Grover Cleveland [applause], and by voting for him you can possibly accomplish your desires, for he and the Democratic party are in favor of free trade.

If, on the other hand, you are in favor of protecting the laboring men of this country, and the laboring women of this country [prolonged applause], then vote for James G. Blaine. [Applause renewed.]

It is for you; it is not for me to decide for you; and every man who is here is directly interested, and must decide this question for himself, for it comes home to every one of you individually, for the prosperity of the country and the welfare of our people depend upon it.

But the Democrats will say: "Why, you are paying too much for the coat you wear; you could buy it in England, under free trade, much cheaper than you can buy it here; therefore take off the duties, repeal the tariff, and buy it there."

Now let me call your attention to this fact: I state it deliberately, that there is not a single protected article, so far as I know, but what is cheaper to-day in the United States than it was in 1860 before the protective tariff was passed. Cotton goods are at least twenty (20) per cent. cheaper than they were in 1860; woolen goods—dress goods—to-day are twenty-five (25) per cent. less. And silk goods, taking them on an average, are from thirty (30) to thirty-five (35) per cent. less in price than they were in 1860 before we had a protective tariff; and so with all kinds of machinery, edge tools, ironware, crockeryware, household goods, furniture, &c.

Whilst I was consul at Liverpool I invoiced steel rails to the amount of thousands, if not millions, of dollars' worth, at \$130 per ton. You can buy them now at the Pennsylvania Steel Works, or at the J. Edgar Thomson Steel Works in Pittsburg, and other works, for twenty-eight dollars per ton, and probably less. George B. Roberts, the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, told me recently that he had made a contract at twenty-seven dollars per ton. A reduction from \$130 under our protective system to twenty-seven dollars! Will any one pretend to say that we have been injured by this—that we have been injured



by the protective system of our country? Has it been the laboring man, or has it been the non-producers, the thirty-two millions of people that do not earn wages in this country, who have been injured? Everything that a man buys, whether he is a farmer or a mechanic, everything that he buys in the way of manufactured commodities, he can buy cheaper to-day than he could in 1860. What has caused this decline in prices? Why is it that since we passed our protective tariff the prices of all manufactured commodities have gone down? The answer is, domestic competition and machinery, with the inventive genius of our people, and their versatility of character, have done it. It is the natural outgrowth of the American system. Just what you might expect from such a nation and people as ours. Give our people proper protection, and they will outstrip the world in production.

But they say you can buy your clothes and manufactured commodities cheaper in England than you can in this country. For argument's sake admitting that we can, is it policy to do so? Is it to the interests of our people and to the working people of our country that we should go and buy there?

I told you that more than \$7,000,000,000 worth of goods were made here last year, and that we paid to the laboring men and women of our country in the manufacture of those goods \$1,500,000,000 in wages. [Applause.] And the question—the great question—before the people is whether we shall continue to manufacture these goods in our own country, and pay the wages to our own people, or to manufacture them in Europe, and pay the wages for manufacturing them to the people of Europe? That is the question. We want the goods; we must have them; they must be made either here or else in Europe. If we make them here we give employment to our own people, and pay the wages for producing them to our own people; if we make them in Europe we give employment to the people of Europe, and pay the wages to their people. In which country will

you have them made? Shall we continue it here, or shall we break down our own system, take away the work from our people, and give it to the people of England, and pay to them what we are now paying to our own people?

There is another solution or theory. Some of these free traders say we will not transfer our industries to England; we will retain a large portion of them by reducing the wages of our working people. And they propose to reduce the price of manufactured commodities, including the coat and clothes you wear, by reducing the wages of our people.

Those are the two alternatives—the reduction of wages here to the standard of the pauper labor of Europe, or else to transfer our industries there, and pay the working people of Europe the \$1,500,000,000, or such portion of it as may be required to produce the goods—one or the other. Are you ready for this? These wages—\$1,500,000,000, which we now pay, do not all remain in the pockets of the laboring people to whom they are paid; a part goes to the storekeeper, to the butcher, the baker, the tailor, the bootmaker, &c., &c. And it is *this that makes* and constitutes business, and which has added so much to the prosperity of our country.

I told you it was a question of bread and butter to the working people of our country, and that every man and woman in this country would be affected by it, and you see that this is so.

Why! you have labor organizations to keep out foreign labor; to prevent it from competing with you; and this is all done in behalf of labor, to protect the laboring people of the country; and here the Democratic party, to help England, propose with one fell swoop either to reduce the price of labor to the standard of the ill-paid labor of Europe, or else to transfer our manufacturing industries to that country, and give the work to the work people there.

We pay in this country in wages to our people, on an average, about double what is paid to the laboring people of Europe, and in some instances three times as much as is paid to the laboring people there for the same labor or



work. I know what I am speaking about. I lived eleven years in England, as consul for my Government, and I know that it is true.

In 1867 the Government sent David A. Wells to Europe for the purpose of investigating the questions of production and labor in England, in France, in Belgium, and in Germany. One morning when I went to my office I found a dispatch from Mr. Seward, stating that at the instance of the Secretary of the Treasury I had been detailed to accompany Mr. Wells; and when Mr. Wells arrived in Liverpool he called on me, and we started on our trip. I therefore have been in many of the manufactories of Europe, and had an opportunity to study them, and learn the wages and the condition of their working people, and I know of what I speak.

On the journey we were at the town of Wendsbury, in what is known there as the black country, and as we were going along I saw a girl, apparently about twenty-one years of age, with a good face. She was unloading coal from a canal boat into a wheel-barrow, and then wheeling it up an inclined plane, and shooting it into a furnace. I said to Mr. Williams, the proprietor of the works, "Will you permit me to ask that girl a question or two?" He at first hesitated, but seeing I was in earnest, said, "Certainly, if you desire it." I said to her: "My good girl, how much do you earn here?" She looked up and said, "When I have full work I can earn five shillings a week" (less than a dollar and a quarter of our money); "but I do not always have full work, and then I can't earn so much." "Well," I said, "how much do you call full work, and how long have you to labor for that five shillings?" Her reply was, six days in a week, and twelve hours in a day. "Well," I answered, "I suppose you live with your father, and are not entirely dependent on your wages?" Her reply was, "Sir, I have no father, but I live with my mother, who is an invalid." "Oh!" I said. "Then probably you have somebody else who helps you?" She said, "No, but my mother gets

eighteen pence per week from the parish." I remarked that this made but six shillings and six pence, and said, "I supposed they had a room?" Her reply was "Yes," and that they paid two and six pence per week for it. I remarked, "This leaves you but four shillings" (about ninety-seven cents of our money.) She said, "That was all." I replied, "Do you tell me that you and your mother warm yourselves, feed yourselves, and clothe yourselves out of that four shillings?" Her reply was, "Certainly; we have to do it." I then asked her to tell me how they did it. Her answer was, "We get bread every day, and potatoes generally every other day; a few potatoes; and we get a piece of meat once a month."

That night at the banquet given to Mr. Wells and myself by Mr. Williams, the table was loaded with every luxury that England could afford. I took to the table on my arm his wife, one of the most accomplished women in England; but I say to you that I did not take one single mouthful of food without thinking of that poor girl who had bread every day, potatoes every other day, and a piece of meat once a month.

Now I do not mean to say that every laboring man or every laboring woman in England is reduced to the straits that this woman was, but I will say that I have seen thousands that were receiving no better wages; and I further say to you that the laboring people of England and the laboring people of Europe are not receiving half the wages that we pay to our people.

Now, if you will look at this question as I have presented it to you, based upon the facts which I have given, and which I know to be true, I ask again and in all earnestness whether you are willing—you laboring men and women—I do not care what your politics may be, whether you are willing to vote on the 4th of November to transfer all our industries to Europe or else to reduce the wages of our laboring people to the same low standard as are paid in England or Europe?

You Irishmen, you Irish Americans, if you want to do that, why, vote for Grover Cleveland. [Applause.] If you wish to aid England, vote for Grover Cleveland and you will do it. You have just cause of complaint against England, who has tyrannized over Ireland and done many things she ought not to have done; and to take vengeance against her, some of you at times improperly resort to dynamite, by which you damage a few buildings and it may be destroy the lives of a few innocent people. To you I say that you have no necessity to resort to dynamite. You hold in your hands an agency and power ten hundred times more powerful and effective against England than all the dynamite in the world, if you will but apply it. It is the ballot. [Applause.] And it is for you Irishmen, you Irish Americans, to say whether you will continue to do in the future as you have done in the past. Vote for free trade, and help and benefit England by doing so. If you want to transfer our industries to England; if you want to reduce the wages of the laboring people of our country to the same standard as the pauper labor of Europe; why, then vote as you have voted heretofore, for England and free trade. But if you desire to sustain American labor, if you want to maintain wages at the present standard and continue the prosperity of our country, then vote for James G. Blaine. [Applause.]

When I tell you what I know, that in consequence of the high wages paid to our people under our protective system the laboring people of this country are better fed, are better housed, are better clothed, are better educated, have more not only of the necessities, but luxuries and comforts, of life than the laboring people of any other country in the world, I only tell you the truth, and I am rejoiced that it is so, for I contend that this is as it should be, and that we should continue so far as we can to pay our working people the same wages we now pay them, without reduction or diminution, for by so doing it enables them to live and have some of the comforts of life about them; to live as human

beings ought to live. Ay, to live as God intended they should live.

Now let us look further into this question. They tell you that you are overtaxed by the duties imposed by our protective tariff; they tell you that the laboring men and farmers of this country are being imposed upon and robbed by having to pay more than they ought to pay for the goods they have to buy. Is this so? Is there any truth in this charge?

Why, in answer just look at the condition of the laboring people of this country. They are, as I have told you, better clothed, better fed, better housed, and better educated than any other people in the world; and how could this be if they were being overtaxed and robbed? If it was true, how could they live as they do? It is not true, my fellow-citizens; and I will tell you some facts which probably may astound you, but which give the lie to all these assertions, yet are as true as the gospel itself.

To-day nine-tenths of the manufactured commodities used by our farmers and laboring people either in their houses, in their workshops, or on their farms, nine-tenths are cheaper to-day in the United States than they are in England. And in proof let us look into the matter. We exported during the fiscal year ending in 1883, over one hundred and thirty millions of yards of cotton goods; of these twenty-eight million eight hundred and fifty-one thousand yards went to England. And in addition to this, we sent of other manufactured cotton goods to England \$334,793 worth, as appears by our trade reports issued by the Government that year. Now how much is one hundred and thirty millions of yards of cotton goods, do you know? If you will go to the equator you will find that it will wrap around the earth three times and leave a large margin to spare.

When in England in the month of March last, I found our cotton goods being sold in Liverpool; I found them being sold in London, and I found them being sold in Manchester itself. And whilst in Italy in the month of December last, in the city of Milan, my family wanted a



few yards of cotton goods, and my wife and daughter went to one of the best stores in that city, and found for sale there cotton goods made in the United States. They gave as a reason for keeping them, that they were better and cheaper than they could get elsewhere. I want to call your attention to the fact of how largely cotton goods enter into domestic use in a family. Cotton goods are used for the underwear of yourself, your wife, and your children; the sheets on which you sleep; the ticking on your beds; the curtains in your rooms; and it may be the table cloths as well as the towels you use, as also the calico dresses you sometimes put upon the female members of your family, are cheaper here than they are in England. That is not all. There is not a single article of wood furniture that is used about your houses but what is cheaper to-day in this country than it is in England. This includes your bedsteads, your bureaus, your tables, your wash-stands, sofas, and chairs, as well as wash-tubs, pails, trays, churns, &c., about the house.

We sent to England during the fiscal year ending in 1883, over \$145,000 worth of edged tools. Why did we send them? Why did we send our axes and our carpenters' and joiners' and other tools? Simply because they are cheaper and better than theirs. The ordinary white crockeryware that is used on our farmers' tables, is made and sold in Trenton to-day—in my own State—cheaper than it is made in England. I will give you the prices: In the United States, at Trenton, we sell plates at eighty cents a dozen; in England the same plates cost three shillings and nine pence, or ninety-one cents in our money.

The pressed glass that we make and use here is cheaper in price and better in quality than that which is made in England. All the kitchen furniture, pots, pans, and kettles, &c., are cheaper here than they are there. We sent to England during the fiscal year ending in 1883, \$740,838 worth of mowers, reapers, plows, and agricultural implements; \$221,510 worth of carriages and carts; \$618,-

551 worth of clocks; \$100,505 worth of watches; \$159,123 worth wearing apparel; \$964,279 worth furniture and wood-ware; \$41,145 worth glass and glassware; \$26,020 worth stoves; \$867,902 worth machinery; \$519,458 worth manufactured iron, &c.; \$480,302 worth musical instruments; \$777,067 worth sewing machines, and \$65,182 worth lamps, besides other manufactured commodities.

But when we come to the farming implements and tools that are used on the farms, they are much cheaper and better than those in Europe. In March of this year I visited the Agricultural Fair in France (and a magnificent exhibition it was). They had not less than fifteen acres of ground covered with agricultural implements, tools, and machinery. The cheapest mower that was on that ground was 510 francs, which in our money is about \$102. You can buy just as good a mower here or in any town in the United States for \$65. The lowest reaper that was there (without a binder was 925 francs, or in our money about \$185. You can buy as good a one in the United States for \$110. The lowest priced horse rake that was there, was 250 francs, or \$50 of our money. You can buy as good here for \$27. The plows, harrows, cultivators, were twenty per cent. dearer than they are in the United States. There was not a fork, hoe, shovel, or spade there, in the whole exhibition, but what was dearer in price and, most of them, inferior in quality to those which we make in this country. [Applause.] And so with carriages, wagons, carts, barrows, &c.

Therefore I repeat to you what I have said before to other audiences: That nine-tenths of the manufactured commodities used by the working people and farmers of this country, are cheaper to-day here than they are in England. This being so, how can it be pretended that our people are being overtaxed, much less robbed, by our protective tariff? How much better off would our people be if our tariff was repealed, and they compelled to go to England and buy there these things? All these commodities are dearer there than they are in the United States, and our people would



have to pay more for them there than they can buy them for in this country.

Now, understand me. I do not pretend to say that silks, laces, and cut glass, and the higher descriptions of woolen goods, decorated china, &c., are cheaper here than they are there. This is not so; but the lower grades of woolens, and boots and shoes, &c., are just as cheap here as they are in England.

Now you may ask me the question, if we can compete with England in manufacturing these commodities, why do we require protection?

I had a committee in Ohio once to wait upon me and ask that question.

I will tell you why we require protection where we can compete with England. We want it to keep the manufacturing industry of these commodities here in our own country; so that we can pay the laboring people of this country the wages for producing them. [Applause.]

We believe it more important and more to our interest to pay these wages to our own people than to pay them to the working people of Europe. [Applause.]

That is one reason. There is another reason. We require a protective tariff to prevent our country from being flooded by over-production. In Europe this is of frequent occurrence, and arises sometimes in this way: Three men, or more, if you please, are manufacturing fancy woolen or any other goods; one may be at Huddersfield, one at Manchester, and another at Bradford, in England. Neither knows what the other is doing. They have to manufacture in advance and upon their own judgment as to style and the demands of the market. For instance, for winter goods they begin to manufacture the spring before.

And these men and possibly others—not knowing what each other are doing, or intend to do—in the exercise of their wits as to the class and style of goods which are likely to be salable in the market the coming autumn or winter, all hit upon the same class or style, and when the season

opens for putting them on the market, find they have made more than the market requires.

There is over-production, and they have got to submit to a loss, and the question with them is the extent of the loss and what is best to be done. They very naturally come to the conclusion not to break down their own market, and resolve to keep up the price at home and realize the profits there as far as they can, and send the surplus to the United States and throw it upon our markets at whatever price it may bring, and in this way break down the market here, and bring ruin and disaster upon our manufacturing and business men.

Whilst I was consul at Liverpool, I invoiced hundreds of invoices, to the amount of millions of dollars, at about half the price it cost to make the goods in England. This was done in consequence of over-production, and the goods, in most instances, were sent to break down our market; to produce, as it often did, consternation and ruin among our merchants and business men.

All of our business men suffer from this, and none more than the industrial and laboring classes of our country.

We therefore want a protective tariff, even where we are competing with Europe in producing, to protect our own industries and our own people from over-production in Europe.

But let us go a step further, and in order to see the effect of protection take an example. We will take the silk industry in New Jersey. We made last year, in New Jersey, over \$22,000,000 worth of silk goods on a capital invested of nearly \$9,000,000, and employed in that industry over eighteen thousand work-people; to whom we paid over \$5,500,000 in wages. The eighteen thousand people employed directly received the five and a half millions of dollars in wages.

Well, most of these operatives had others who were dependent upon them, and who lived off of the wages earned. But this is not all. These wages did not all remain in the

hands of the operatives, but a part were paid to the store-keeper, the butcher, the baker, the tailor or dressmaker, the bootmaker and other mechanics, and a part, it may be, to teachers, clergymen, doctors, as well as the tax-gatherer. All these people and hundreds of others, directly or indirectly, live off of the wages thus paid. Now, if you were to put all of these people together in a town, you would make not less than ninety thousand people, all of whom would live directly or indirectly off of this industry.

Now, if the Morrison bill had passed last winter, taking off twenty per cent., as it proposed to do, of the duties imposed on silk goods, every one of those silk manufactories would have had to stop, and the eighteen thousand people employed, and those dependent upon them, and those living indirectly off of them, would have been thrown out of employment and their living in this way injured, to say nothing of the capital that would have been lost or sunk.

Who would that have benefited? Would it have benefited the laboring people thrown out of employment, or those directly or indirectly dependent upon them? They all would have been injured.

Would it have benefited the farmer? No! The farmer feeds all these people, and to this extent is benefited. If you break them down you destroy his market and he is injured. It is the money that is earned in the mills that pays the farmer for his products, either directly or indirectly, and if the money ceases they cannot buy, and the farmer loses his market. Who would have been benefited? England, France, and Belgium—these countries that manufacture silk goods—they would have been benefited, not our country, or the people of the United States; but the people in these countries in Europe, they would have been benefited by it.

And what I say with regard to the silk industry—I only introduce it as an example—will apply to every other industry in our country; to the manufacture of metals as well as textile goods. All to a greater or less extent would suffer.

But the free trader brings forward this argument—the doctrine of reciprocity; that is, if you don't buy of me, I won't buy of you. And they say if we will but repeal our tariff and admit English goods and French goods and German goods into our country free of duty, that our trade would be greatly increased. That these countries in Europe would buy more of us, and we more of them. That every import would bring a corresponding export. We certainly would have to buy more of them if we destroyed our own manufactories. Suppose we were to do this, would they buy or take more of us? They would buy then just as they do now. Would take what they required and nothing more.

My fellow-citizens, I tell you there never was a greater fallacy attempted to be imposed upon an intelligent people than this doctrine of reciprocity.

You may search the commercial history of the nations of the world for the last hundred years, as I have done, and you will not find a single instance in trade between any two nations of Europe, during this period of a hundred years, where this principle has ever applied. Not one! and there is nothing whatever in the doctrine.

If you will look at it one moment for yourselves, you will see the utter fallacy of the argument. There is no such thing as national wealth, in the ordinary acceptation of that term—I mean, as government wealth. When we speak of national wealth it is the aggregate wealth of the individuals comprising the government. Nor is there any such thing as dealings between one nation and another nation. All transactions in the way of trade and business are done by the individuals of each nation—an American dealing with an Englishman, and an Englishman dealing with an American. And in their dealings they never look or take into consideration the balance of trade—whether it is on the one side or on the other.

Why, this will come home to every practical man in this meeting if he will consider it for one moment. My friend

John Patterson is a corn merchant in Liverpool; suppose he wants to buy ten thousand bushels of wheat, what does he do? Does he examine to see whether the balance of trade is in favor of the United States or against the United States before he buys? Not at all! If a merchant were to do this he would be called a dunce or fool. What he does is to telegraph to New York to learn the prices there, and to the Crimea or other wheat market to get the prices there, and he buys wherever he can purchase at the lowest price. It is a matter of business, and he buys where he can make the most money; he does not care about the balance of trade. So with a broker or merchant who wants to buy a thousand bales of cotton, he buys wherever he can get them the cheapest.

So does Mr. Vanderbilt if he wants to buy a thousand tons of steel rails. Do you suppose he looks at the balance of trade between the United States and England? Not for a moment. If he can buy them cheaper in New York than England he buys them in New York, but if cheaper in England than in the United States he buys them there.

What does he care about the balance of trade? It is a question of price and nothing else; and as a general rule, all these contracts between the individuals of the different countries are for cash or money, and there is no barter or exchange of different commodities in them. The individual buys where he can obtain the commodities the cheapest, and pays for it in cash or money. This is the rule. And there is neither exchange or barter in it.

Therefore I say there is nothing in the doctrine of reciprocity, as put forth by the free traders, and never has been.

Now, there is another matter. I have told you what the Cobden Club, working in behalf of England, is doing to break down our protective system.

You may ask the question: Why is England doing this? Why is she making such herculean efforts to break down our protective system, and introduce her own system of



free trade in its place? You certainly will not pretend she is doing it for love! I do not mean to say that she is any worse than other nations, or that she is more selfish than others; but she is certainly not less so. No, my friends, it is not for love.

I will tell you why they are doing it. I have lived among them eleven years, and know them well and know their motives. England to-day does not raise sufficient food to feed her own people! She cannot do it!

For ten articles of food which I can name to you—live animals, meat, breadstuffs, butter, cheese, lard, fish, eggs, potatoes, and rice, she paid last year over \$600,000,000.

In 1870, thirteen years ago, she paid for those ten articles of food \$276,000,000—less than half what she is paying now.

And if you look over her statistics for the last twenty years, you will find that there is a gradual increase year after year for these products; and, if she continues to increase as she is now doing, in the year 1900 she will have to pay for those ten articles of food not less than \$1,500,000,000.

No nation in the world can stand this for any great length of time. No people understand this better than the English themselves. And the question with her statesmen and politicians is, how to provide cheap food for their people.

I do not state these facts from hearsay. I take them from their own published records. I get them directly from their parliamentary proceedings.

Therefore you can see it is for the interest of England to get food cheap to feed her people.

Now, if she can break down our protective system, she knows very well that the greater portion of our laboring men now engaged in manufacturing would be driven as a matter of necessity into agricultural pursuits, and that this would result in over-production of agricultural products, and tend to put down prices, it may be—indeed, most probably would put down prices of agricultural products fifty



per cent.—possibly even more than this. The farmer would then have to sell for fifty cents what he now gets a dollar for. Who would be benefited by this? The farmer could not raise one single bushel more of grain per acre than he does now; but he could then only get half the price he now receives for what he would have to sell.

England would be benefited by it. She could then buy her food for half she now has to pay, and the farmers of our country would be the losers. What England would gain we would lose; and the loss would fall on the farmers of our country.

That is not all. There is another matter connected with this. You talk about depression here! Why! there is five times as much depression in England as there is here. You talk about a few men that are turned out of work here. Where there are five men turned out here, there are ten there; while there is one mill stopped here, there are two stopped there.

England wants a market for her manufactured commodities. She cannot sell what she is now producing, and this makes the depression she is suffering. Now, if she can break down our manufactories, or even one-half of them, she expects that we will buy from her what we are now producing, and in this way that she will make a market for all her manufactured commodities, and increase her business to this extent, and no doubt this would be the result, unless we reduced the wages of our people to the same standard of the pauper labor of Europe.

She understands this; every newspaper in England understands it, and every statesman in England understands it.

What would be the effect of this? It would be loss to us, and gain to her! She would gain on both ends of the stick.

She would be able to get her food which she is compelled to buy—it may be at half the price she is now paying—and at the same time create a market for her manufactured

commodities in this country. This is what England is driving at; this is why the Cobden Club is doing what it is in this country, and you see they are working for themselves—for England, and not for our country. They are to make by it, we to lose; and the loss would fall upon our industries and our laboring people.

Now, I feel that I have trespassed upon your time longer than I ought to have done; but before I close I want to say to you that if any man asks you upon what ground you justify protection, tell him this:—That the Deity has impressed upon all animated matter the principle of protection. The bird of the air is protected by feathers, the beast that roams over the plain with hair, and the tortoise and the snail that crawl upon the ground are protected by shells. That man, possessed of a higher intelligence, protects himself from the cold by garments, and protects himself from the storms by a house which he builds. And the bird that builds its nest, and the beaver that builds the dam, do so but in obedience to that great and universal law which the Deity himself has stamped upon matter. And if it is the duty of a man to protect himself; and if it is his duty to protect the family which God has given him; how much more is it not the duty of the Government—a Government of the people, for the people—to protect the people who have formed it! [Applause.]

And in conclusion, permit me to say, that this country—if we continue to adhere to the American system of protection—stretching as it does from the Atlantic Ocean to the broad Pacific, and from almost the frozen regions of the north to the sunny regions of the south; with every description of soil and with every variety of climate to excite and foster production; with inexhaustible beds of coal and unbounded mineral resources; when filled, as it soon will be, with a free people, educated, intelligent, and industrious; with an inventive genius not surpassed, if equaled; with its free and liberal institutions, is destined to become the great manufacturing country of the world. [Prolonged applause.]









